

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,839,744 of Kloba ("Kloba"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 1 as amended sets forth "receiving a *synchronization identifier (ID)* from the server, the synchronization ID being a unique identifier associated with the computing device" *and* "receiving a *record extraction sequence ID* from the server" (claim 1, emphasis added). In contrast, Kloba fails to disclose at least the above limitation.

According to Kloba, a client initializes a synchronization session and sends a null data marker [Cn] to a server. The data marker is a synchronization token *associated with the state of data* on the client. More specifically, a synchronization token is a number that is sequentially increased by the server with each synchronization. (Kloba, col. 18, ln. 4-13). Kloba does not disclose or suggest a synchronization ID being a unique identifier associated with the client, which was analogized to be the computer device recited in the Office Action (Office Action, p. 3). Furthermore, Kloba does not disclose or suggest receiving a synchronization ID *and* a record extraction sequence ID. Therefore, Kloba fails to anticipate claim 1 as amended. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1, Kloba fails to anticipate claims 11 and 21. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5, 12-15, and 22-25 depend, directly or indirectly from claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Thus, having additional limitations, claims 2-5, 12-15, and 22-25 are not anticipated by Kloba for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claims 1, 11, and 21. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 6 as amended sets forth "providing a *synchronization identifier* (ID) to the handheld device from the server, the synchronization ID being a unique identifier associated with the handheld device" *and* "providing a *record extraction sequence ID* to the handheld device from the server" (claim 6; emphasis added). In contrast, Kloba fails to disclose at least the above limitation.

According to Kloba, a client initializes a synchronization session and sends a null data marker [Cn] to a server. The data marker is a synchronization token *associated with the state of data* on the client. More specifically, a synchronization token is a number that is sequentially increased by the server with each synchronization. (Kloba, col. 18, ln. 4-13). Kloba does not disclose or suggest a synchronization ID being a unique identifier associated with the client, which was analogized to be the computer device recited in the Office Action (Office Action, p. 3). Furthermore, Kloba does not disclose or suggest providing a synchronization ID *and* a record extraction sequence ID. Therefore, Kloba fails to anticipate claim 6 as amended. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 6, Kloba fails to anticipate claims 16 and 26. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 7-10, 17-20, and 27-30 depend, directly or indirectly from claims 6, 16, and 26, respectively. Thus, having additional limitations, claims 7-10, 17-20, and 27-30

are not anticipated by Kloba for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claims 6, 16, and 26. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome by the remarks, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the pending claims be allowed.


To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. If any other petition is necessary for consideration of this paper, it is hereby so petitioned.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 3/1, 2006

  
Chui-kiu Teresa Wong  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 48,042

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300